

## REMARKS

### Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, and 12-28 remain for examination. Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that allowable subject matter is contained in claims 12-29.

### Submission of Formal Drawings

Applicant submits herewith replacement sheets of formal drawings for Figures 1, 6 and 7 as approved by the Examiner in the previous Office Action, paper number 12, mailed July 2, 2003.

### Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Arai (5,517,551).

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 1 is anticipated by Arai since Arai discloses that each extension telephone number has a different line key (118) set for the plurality of extension numbers respectively. The Examiner points to column 2, lines 31-46, column 4, lines 11-24 and to Figures 1, 4 and 5A-C as well as Figures 7-8.

First of all, the Examiner's reference to the plurality of extension numbers 103-105 refers to the extension telephones in Figure 1 of Arai. Applicant's invention, however, is specifically directed to mobile units and thus would presumably correspond to the mobile units 109-114 not to the extension telephones 103-105. Moreover, while Arai teaches that a plurality of extension numbers are present for the plurality of extension telephones and fixed units (fixed units 106, and 107) Arai shows that each mobile unit only has a single speech button 312 as well as a keypad 309 for inputting the outgoing call number. The speech button 312 is also utilized to receive a call as explained in the flow chart in Figure 7 and in column 4 beginning at line 10. The display unit 311 of Arai is simply that, namely a display and is not a plurality of keys.

The simplest way to understand the differences between applicant's invention and the Arai reference is to compare applicant's Figure 2 with Arai's Figure 4. Applicant's Figure 2 shows a plurality of line keys 12 which is notably absent in Figure 4 of Arai. The line keys 12 are not to be confused with the display 15 of applicant which is also shown in Figure 2. In contrast, Arai merely has a display 311 and does not have any line keys unless the speech button 312 could be considered a single line key.

In an attempt to even more clearly recite applicant's invention, applicant has amended the claims to indicate that the line keys are physically present on each mobile unit. In applicant's view, the claims as stated in the amendment dated October 2, 2003 already contain the substance of applicant's present claims, namely, that there are a plurality of different line keys set for the plurality of extension numbers respectively. However, the current amendment emphasizes that would appear to be implicit in applicant's original language that these line keys are physically on each mobile unit. Thus, claim 1, as well as independent claim 4, now recite that the plurality of mobile stations have a plurality of extension numbers and a corresponding plurality of different line keys physically present thereon. This language serves to even more clearly differentiate applicant's invention from the applied prior art since it may readily be seen from Figure 4 of Arai, that Arai does not disclose a plurality of different line keys physically present on the mobile unit and each line key associated with a corresponding plurality of extension numbers.

## **Conclusions**

In view of the arguments set forth above and the amendments made hereto, it is submitted that applicant's claims readily distinguish over the applied prior art and that the section 102 rejection must be withdrawn.

Moreover, applicant's dependent claims contain additional limitations and further limit the recitations of independent claims 1 and 4 from which they depend. Thus, there dependent claims are likewise deemed allowable.

The Application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3-24-04

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5407

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,257